

REMARKS

Claims 1–22 are pending in the application. Claims 1 and 12 are amended herewith.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §102 and §103

Claims 1–5, 8, 12–16, and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Reisman (US Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0031058.)

The Examiner further rejected claims 6, 7, 9–11, 12 (sic), 18 and 20–22 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Reisman in view of Kalika et al (US Patent Application Publication No. 2007/0054670.)

Favorable reconsideration of this rejection in view of the above amendments and the following explanation is respectfully requested.

Reisman teaches a method and apparatus for browsing using alternative linkbases. His teaching provides Internet or wireless connections to a home LAN where return channels are available to allow for interactivity.

Although Reisman does indeed teach a broadcast video signal as per Fig. 1, there is no sign that he teaches a broadcast multi-channel video signal. In general, although it is known to send video signals via the Internet, and even to direct users to a web page where they may select a channel of interest, it is not known to provide via the Internet an actual *multi-channel* signal to the individual user as this would be wasteful of resources. That is to say the source may offer multiple channels, but only a single channel, the desired channel, arrives at the user. This is contrary to the requirement of claim 1 that the multi-channel signal arrives at the user.

Reisman does not teach a user *broadcast* receiver installation. Reisman merely teaches the Internet, which *does not broadcast* but rather provides specific signals addressed specifically to a user's IP address.

Even if the Examiner does not accept the above, Reisman certainly does not teach a user broadcast receiver installation which is capable of receiving a multi-channel signal, as the broadcast installation is required to do by present claim 1.

Reisman teaches a return link. Reisman further teaches a wireless link. Reisman does not however teach that broadcast receiver installations of the users form relay nodes of the wireless network.

That is to say Reisman fails to teach or even hint that the return channel is a wireless terrestrial network made up of the *same* broadcast receiver installations which receive the multi-channel broadcast signals in the first place.

The same features distinguish claim 12.

The remaining claims mentioned in this section of the Office Action are believed to be allowable as being dependent on an allowable main claim.

All of the matters raised by the Examiner have been dealt with and are believed to have been overcome.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all the claims now pending in the application are allowable.

An early Notice of Allowance is therefore respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Martin D. Moynihan
Registration No. 40,338

Date: January 30, 2008

Enclosure:

Petition for 1-Month Extension of Time